

## SINGLE TAX DEPARTMENT.

### ARE WE WEALTHY?

The Land Tax Problem in Great Britain.—The Family Herald, published in London, asks the question, "Are we wealthy?" and concludes that the true answer is "Yes; in the wrong place." The editor notes that while the sound of the carriage wheels rolling to the fashionable ball that costs \$1,000 more than the carriage of the poor is heard, the poor are not heard. There is not a good horse that Mother England does not care for, and there are half a million children who can rarely satisfy their hunger, and are stowed in dens where the horses would die in a week. English people did not understand the genesis of poverty until the developments of society in America showed with terrible rapidity the historical development of poverty in Britain. Poverty in England was before that a horrid mystery; but in America its development was brought out in lurid distinctness. In the old countries the men who first seized the land were able to subvert it for money or military service. Gradually manufacturers came, and then great centers of population with workmen ready to sell their labor for a bare living. Thus came about the appalling spectacle of old world slums. All this has been done in America with the rapidity of some shifting. With this swift object lesson before them Englishmen have cried: "Back to the land; the land for the nation." They now see that the hope held out by reform bills was vain. For a time the church exercised a conservative influence, and the people who had come to believe that they were like dumb-brutes said: "Why not give the poor their share of this world's good things since there is nothing for them in another world?"

The editor says a hope if only the masses will exercise their power under existing laws. The people must resolve that they shall no longer live in slums. Prof. Huxley has done much good, and he once spoke of a Jacob's ladder from the gutter to the university. The ladder, however, reaches only from tradesman's shop and the artisan's dwelling to the seats of higher learning, for the child can not climb. Meanwhile Huxley has become so savagely conservative that he may next denounce Magna Charta as a mistake. Suppose an upward ladder of the people should say:

"You tell us, professor, that we are wealthy, and that it is right that the men should be purged while we are bitten with famine. If Britain is so wealthy, how is it that eleven million acres of good agricultural land are now out of cultivation, while the people who have the land used to feed are crushed in the slums and the tenements? The laborers, or men beyond the case in the case of the farmers? We want to be impartial, but we freely own that we should not like to answer that question, and we do not believe the professor could. The men who use to supply our fighting force are now becoming extinct. If the professor would pick up some kind of work, then the second generation are weaklings and a burden to us while, if they go abroad, they are still removed from the mother of Nations, who needs her sons of the soil, even though she may be the mother of the land now States which they are leaving. And while rats and mice and obscure vermin are gradually taking possession of the land on which Britons were bred, the signs of bursting wealth are thick about us. Is a nation rich that can not afford even to keep the right of man who once defended her? To us the gradual return of the land to its primitive wilderness is more than depressing. There are districts on the borders of Hertford and Essex which might make a sentimental traveler sit down and cry. It all seems so strange, it looks so poverty stricken, so filthy, so sordid, so like the site of a slum after all the houses have been leveled for a dozen years; and this in the midst of our England! We say nothing about land laws and so forth, but we will say that those who fancy the fumes can survive when the fumes are dissipated are much mistaken. The letters we receive from provincial tradesmen in little market towns are sadder in the extreme for the return of the land to the wilderness stage is ruining men who were once among the very pillars of the State."

**ALARM IN NASHVILLE.**  
Single Tax Doctrine Seems a Terrible Bugaboo.  
Despite the intelligent understanding of the single tax doctrine in Memphis, it seems to be a terrible bugaboo in the Tennessee capital. Mr. J. W. Davis, in a letter to the Nashville American, is manifestly in a state of alarm, similar to that which frequently prevailed when the simpler form of industrial slavery existed in the South. Mr. Davis says: "At I understand in Georgia, he is a crank or visionary theorist any more than Mr. Lincoln, Seward, Wendell Phillips, Garrett Smith, Sumner & Co. were when they began to preach and teach their abolition doctrine to the North. And who will say that they were not an honest set? And they kept up their honest devilment until they drenched our fair southland with blood, murdered our best men, impoverished our women and children, sent many of them to the wash tub and our old men to untimely graves. No, you and friend Frost are mistaken in the following of Mr. George. Don't you know the plebeian antipathy to the landlord?"

This is charming. The little thrust at the plebeian has the true flavor of the old time denunciations of the mudsills, and makes the parallel almost perfect. Let us hope for equal similitude in the following of the blood and wash tub. Mr. George is as practical as Lincoln, as enthusiastic as Garrison, as eloquent as Phillips and as determined as Sumner in emancipating the white men of both North and South from the remaining form of industrial slavery. The men who still hang their heads in looking on the new movement for freedom with alarm—provided they are profiting by the existing condition. They ought to make sure of this fact so as to avoid the folly of the "poor whites" in Lee's army.

As a matter of fact, however, the whole trouble was about "property and niggers," of which they owned neither, and that it was a "rich man's war and a poor man's fight."

The score is evidently having practical results. At a regular meeting the Un-American Alliance and Industrial Union, has passed a set of resolutions declaring that the Davidson County Union proposes to support the national organization that the Davidson County Union proposes to support the national organization "in spite of its unnatural action in St. Louis," and therefore Un-American and withdraws from the country union

and returns its charter. The resolutions are accompanied by a statement published in the Nashville American, which begins as follows: "In November last the Knights of Labor held a convention in Atlanta and adopted a platform demanding the virtual confiscation of every man's land. The language of their demand is that the taxes on all land shall be equal to the whole unearned increment. The simple meaning of such a demand is that every man owning land shall be required to pay to the government the unearned increment of the land, and the name of taxes, all profit accruing to him from such ownership. Such a course on the part of the government would be confiscation pure and simple. Shortly after the promulgation of this platform the National Union met in St. Louis and Powerfully, the leader of the Knights, attended that meeting and asked for conferences. To our great surprise and mortification the National Union received with a perfect ovation this man who had just aided in making this platform of confiscation. In the language of the Teller, the special organ of our State union, when Powerfully entered the hall 'where after cheer went up from the body.' 'Our farmers,' members of the National Union, 'fell in love with Powerfully.' The president of the National Union held a secret conference with him, and as a result the National Union formed a confederation with the Knights of Labor and agreed to cooperate with them in selecting men to the legislative and congressional offices and in securing legislation."

The paper goes on at great length, protesting that the eligibility clause of the constitution of the alliance has been so altered as to permit mechanics to become members, and suggesting that negro members of the Knights of Labor may be brought into contact with the farmers. The gist of the whole complaint, however, lies in the paragraph quoted, in which the purpose of the alliance is clearly stated and bitterly attacked again.

The Un-American Alliance appears to be something of a big game organization, and it will be well for working farmers in the South to take note of the fact that those who profess to be mechanics, and who take from the land owner the profits accruing to him from ownership. This is, of course, a serious matter to men who hold land that other men work, the owners drawing their income from it in the shape of rent or interest on mortgages. The single tax is right, that the farmers should be purged while we are bitten with famine. If Britain is so wealthy, how is it that eleven million acres of good agricultural land are now out of cultivation, while the people who have the land used to feed are crushed in the slums and the tenements? The laborers, or men beyond the case in the case of the farmers? We want to be impartial, but we freely own that we should not like to answer that question, and we do not believe the professor could. The men who use to supply our fighting force are now becoming extinct. If the professor would pick up some kind of work, then the second generation are weaklings and a burden to us while, if they go abroad, they are still removed from the mother of Nations, who needs her sons of the soil, even though she may be the mother of the land now States which they are leaving. And while rats and mice and obscure vermin are gradually taking possession of the land on which Britons were bred, the signs of bursting wealth are thick about us. Is a nation rich that can not afford even to keep the right of man who once defended her? To us the gradual return of the land to its primitive wilderness is more than depressing. There are districts on the borders of Hertford and Essex which might make a sentimental traveler sit down and cry. It all seems so strange, it looks so poverty stricken, so filthy, so sordid, so like the site of a slum after all the houses have been leveled for a dozen years; and this in the midst of our England! We say nothing about land laws and so forth, but we will say that those who fancy the fumes can survive when the fumes are dissipated are much mistaken. The letters we receive from provincial tradesmen in little market towns are sadder in the extreme for the return of the land to the wilderness stage is ruining men who were once among the very pillars of the State."

**Triumph for Single Tax.**  
The first of last month a public spirited citizen offered two prizes for the best newspaper articles on "A New Lynn," or how to increase the wealth and population and rebuild the burned district in the style of the time, 80 to first and \$25 to second, to be decided by popular vote. I regarded this as my opportunity to show a little seed, and availed myself of it, and, much to my surprise, I captured the first prize, winning by two votes. My argument was on the single tax line. We single taxers have no doubts as to this much in the light of a triumph of our principles, and are consequently somewhat elated. It demonstrates that the public mind is capable of discerning truth, even if it is not ready to understand it.

The article received a second publication, and consequently a more extended reading.—Willard W. Gray, Lynn, Mass.

**His is the Eloquence of Truth.**  
Aside from all questions of sympathy with his doctrine, the single taxer, in the style of Mr. Henry George for the purposes of instruction or public address, whether spoken or written, to come about as near perfection as that of any writer or speaker now before the English speaking public. His prose is solid, nervous, strong, fluent, and with beautiful turns of expression, but its rhythmic rhythm of a robust, sensible prose, and has not that sickening regularity of rhythm and alliteration of blank verse sweetness which renders Mr. Ingersoll's style so objectionable.—Chicago Unionist.

**A National Lecturer.**  
The single tax is gaining advocates in our town. The fact is that no reasonable man can give the subject fair and disinterested treatment, and not yield to the argument based on unquestionable facts. Old party prejudice are so strong, however, that with many ignorance is bliss. I believe that if you had a national lecturer who could travel all over the United States and present the subject in its true form, and at the same time take a lot of the literature to sell, it would spread the principles. The Farmers' Union has a national lecturer, and their land ideas are close to the single tax idea.—J. A. Wesson, in the Standard.

The one thing which has held me close and fast to the single tax movement when I might otherwise have abandoned it is the strong religious spirit which prevails in—C. L. Brower, Tripoli.

As effort is being made to leave the Knights of Labor and home owners in Brooklyn join issues to have equalized the taxation on homes as against vacant lots.

"So you are going," said one department clerk to another. "Yes, I am going to tell very handsome and unpopular at her house." "What has occurred?" "I am disposed to think she took offense at a remark I made about a chicken she had for dinner. What was the remark?" "I wondered whether it had been hatched from a hard-boiled egg."—Washington Post.

All nations have their peculiar likings for furniture, but what the Russians chiefly enjoy is sitting down on Ottomans.—Baltimore American.

## AGRICULTURAL HINTS.

### CATTLE VS. HOGS.

An Iowa Swine-Breeder Criticizes Premium Lists.

I have known for a long time, says a writer in the Kansas Farmer, that agricultural societies in general, if not invariably, offer far more money for cattle than for hog premiums, and I have sometimes wondered why the difference was so great and the more I think about it the more I wonder what good reason they have for offering any more for cattle than for hog premiums. I have just consulted several leading State fair premium lists and I find that four of them offer nearly four times as much for cattle as for hogs, on the average. Is this right? Is it justice to the swine-breeder? If it is some one will be able to show in a logical way why it is that cattle deserve larger premiums than hogs, but until we see some better reason advanced than merely the fact that all agricultural societies do offer far more for cattle than for hog premiums I will take the ground that hogs are not less meritorious in proportion to their worth as compared with cattle in premium lists of our agricultural fairs.

But perhaps cattle are more aristocratic. I imagine there are some people who think so, for I once heard a remark that indicated as much. It was at a meeting of the Iowa Swine-Breeder's Association, and there was one of a committee appointed by the State Swine-Breeder's Association to present to the board of the annual State fair, and among other things we were instructed to insist on the board retaining for raising and promoting the swine as superior to the swine department for another year. But we were told by one of the members of the board that one of the members of the present board, however, that we could not have the same man again as our superintendent. For," said he, "he is a good man, but he is not a swine man, and we will have to give him the cattle this year." I had never looked at it in the light of "promotion" to go from one "hog house" to the "cattle barn," but from the above statement, and from the fact that much larger amounts are offered for cattle than for hogs, it seems to me that it is a very fair man's duty to consider it promotion and to believe cattle more aristocratic.

Are there any more people interested in cattle-raising than in hog-raising? Not only not, but furthermore the cattle-raising is a more profitable business. Well, States could not long survive without the hog, for in the last five years there is scarcely a cattle-feeder in the United States whose balance-sheet would not show a loss except for the pork produced by hogs grazing after the soil the richest of fertilizers. Are they then, not under-estimated in premium lists as compared with cattle?

Do you think it less trouble or expense to exhibit swine than cattle? If so you are mistaken. The railroad transportation is the same, but when you are at your railroad destination you can at any time unload your cattle and walk them right off to their stalls in the fair ground, while the swine exhibitor has to pay wagon transportation to and from the fair ground and perhaps wait for hours before he can secure teams, and then he has to work long hours, and unloading one car of hogs is a more tedious task in handling five cars of cattle. So we claim that in the line of trouble and expense the swine should be entitled to the larger premium.

It took more brains to breed fine cattle than it does to breed fine swine. The hogs, therefore, might be considered for giving cattle the preference. But no man who has had extensive experience in breeding both will deny that it takes as much brains to breed good hogs as it does to breed good cattle, and certainly none will deny that the pig-breeder's farm is as important to the farmer as his cattle, for I will venture the assertion that there are ten men that have lifted the mortgage from the farm with hogs to one that paid it with cattle. Ask any banker, money-lender or business man what is the most frequent reason for farmers to when they can pay a note or an account; they will almost universally tell you it is "When I sell my hogs." Very seldom, indeed, will they say: "When I sell my cattle."

**A GOOD DEVICE.**  
How to Make Trellises and Frames for Bush Fruits.  
Where raspberries and blackberries are grown on a large scale for market, says Popular Gardening, the expense and labor involved by the use of ever so simple a form of trellis or frame must prevent the grower from attempting to do more than keep the plants within bounds by heroic pruning. And this usually answers the purpose very well. In the home garden, however, we always pay somewhat greater attention to convenience and neat appearance than in the field.

If our garden patch is large, we may content ourselves with setting a simple stake to each bush, and tie the latter to it somewhat loosely. Or we may confine each row of bushes within two lines of wires or laths, fastened to stakes set along each side of the row. All these are simple means of keeping the bushes upright and the paths between the rows unobstructed by thorny canes that are apt to hook into the clothes and perhaps into the feet of the good wife and the daughters of the house.

Our illustration shows a way of treating single bushes, suitable for a few plants in a small garden. It needs no further description, except to say that the frame may be made about fifteen inches square, and the stakes about two feet high from the ground.

NO PERSON can be a really accomplished driver who does not know a good deal about the natural disposition of a horse—why he obeys and when he will be likely to disobey; how to educate him, and how to take advantage of that education.—Massachusetts Ploverman.

One of the very best articles for oxling is salt hay. It is tough in texture, lies close, is not easily disturbed by the wind, and if stacked or sheltered after the crop is gathered, will last three seasons. In addition, it has no seeds to grow and disseminate.

## THE KING OF WHYDAH.

### A Savage Potentate Who Maintained a Thousand Wives.

How a Bold Native Thwarted the Power of Authority of the Royal African—A Chief Whose Family Consisted of Thousands of Members.

The King of Whydah's wives were objects of special care to himself and of enforced veneration to his people. The favorite ones lived in the palace with him; the others were accommodated in adjoining buildings. No men were employed in the royal household, and the King was served solely by his wives. When visitors came to see the King he received them alone, taking good care that his wives were out of sight. It was, indeed, held a sacrilege to so much as look at any of these royal spouses.

When repairs, which could not be done at home, were needed in the palace, they migrated from the affected portion, and the plumbers and glaziers coming off to keep on shouting out in the whole time they were at work in case any of the wives, not acquainted with the fact of their presence, should happen to pass by. When the King's wives set out to work in the plantations, which they did every morning in batches of three to four hundred at a time, they used to cry "stand clear," as they went, and any men who were in their path prostrated themselves, and did not raise their eyes till they had passed. On account of the awe in which his wives were held, the King found them a very useful and speedy executive to carry out his commands. If any person was found guilty of a crime the King sent a detachment of his wives round to the man's house in order to search it of its contents. This done, the wives were usually very soon effected, for on the approach of the King's wives the man was unable to remain and defend his property. One instance, however, is related by Bosman, in which a native was clever and bold enough to thwart the King's wives. Hearing that he had been accused before the King, and that a company of the King's wives had been sent to wreck his house, he collected all the gunpowder he possessed, and, placing it in a heap just beneath his doorway, he awaited the arrival of his spoilers, fire-branded and hand. When they entered the house in the usual formula, "Make way for the King's wives," he replied that he would not stir from the spot on which he stood, and if they attempted to cross his threshold he would blow himself and all of them up together. This remark, which he uttered in a calm and collected manner, after a consultation among themselves they determined to return to the King and inform him of the reception they had met. But their intended victim was too quick for them. Slipping round another way, he reached the King's first, and cleared himself of the accusation so satisfactorily that the order against him was countermanded. This attempt, Bosman remarks, was a very bold one, requiring great nerve to carry it through so successfully, and that if it had failed, a painful death would have been the punishment. The King's supply of wives was kept up to the full number by three of his chief capitalists, who had very little else to do than select and procure for him the most beautiful virgins. A fresh wife after presentation, lived with the King for four days, after which she was relegated to the quarters occupied by the other wives, and became, practically, a nun for the rest of her life, with the unenviable privilege of working like a slave on the King's estate. Under these circumstances it is a matter of surprise that the honor of a royal alliance was little coveted among maidens, some of whom had even been known to prefer a speedy death to the distinction. Bosman mentions the story of a young girl who, having been selected for this purpose, refused to go, and, on being brought closely pursued, in her despair jumped down a well and was killed. "I leave her case," remarks the same historian, "undetermined by the ladies." When each man was well provided in respect of wives, it was by nature that his children should be proportionately numerous. Bosman has heard, in several cases, incredible numbers ascribed to one man; but, doubting the truth of the statements, he one day took aside a chief, on whose word he could rely, and asked him to tell him candidly how many children he himself possessed. This was evidently a tender point with the chief, for he seemed pained, and at length with a sigh, apparently of regret, he said: "I must confess that I have only seventy children now living, but I have had as many more who are now dead." The chief then produced a small number in his estimation, and quite unworthy of a captain of his rank, most of his comrades possessing at least two hundred. Indeed, he assured Bosman that there was one man who, with his sons and grandsons alone, rose up and defied a powerful enemy who was coming against the King. This family numbered three thousand men, women and children.

**THE MARKETS.**  
NEW YORK, May 26, 1890.  
CATTLE—Native Steers, \$4.40 to \$5.75; COTTON—Middling, 12 1/2 to 12 3/4; WHEAT—No. 2 Red, 90 1/2 to 91 1/2; OATS—No. 2, 28 1/2 to 29 1/2; CORN—No. 2, 24 1/2 to 25 1/2; RICE—No. 2, 13 1/2 to 14 1/2; SUGAR—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COFFEE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TEA—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SPICES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; OILS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; FLOUR—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BUTTER—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EGGS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LARD—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HAMS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BACON—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; CURED MEATS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; DRIED FRUITS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; NUTS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SEEDS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GRAIN—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LIVESTOCK—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; POULTRY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; FISH—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; VEGETABLES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; FRUITS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BEVERAGES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TOBACCO—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; CIGARS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SOAP—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; CLOTHING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SHOES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; FURNITURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; CARPETS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PAINTS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GLASS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; CERAMICS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; METALS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TEXTILES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PAPER—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BOOKS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MUSIC—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; ARTS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; GEOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; BIOGRAPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; LITERATURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; SCIENCE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MEDICINE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; AGRICULTURE—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MINING—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; MANUFACTURES—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; TRANSPORTATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; COMMUNICATIONS—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RECREATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; EDUCATION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; RELIGION—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; PHILOSOPHY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to 12 1/2; HISTORY—No. 2, 11 1/2 to